

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/698,040	Applicant(s) HAIT, DAVID	
	Examiner STEFANOS KARMIS	Art Unit 3693	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Yamima Eadan, Reg. No. 64,764.

(3) David Hait, Inventor.

(2) Morris E. Cohen, Reg. No. 39,947.

(4) Carol See and Stefanos Karmis, Examiners.

Date of Interview: 10 May 2010.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 10-25.

Identification of prior art discussed: Breen and Widdicks.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants discussed the details of the invention. Agreement was reached that the calculation of node vega was not taught in the prior art of record. Examiners reserve the right to conduct further search of prior art regarding this limitation..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Stefanos Karmis/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3693